DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 963 UD 020 901

TITLE	Final Evaluation Report for the 1978-1979 Title VII Bilingual Project, Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Washington.
INSTITUTION	Cultural and Humanistic Educational Systems and Services, Inc., Diamond Bar, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[79]
GRANT	047-AA-NS-0-9-GA
NOTE	84p.; Rating form may be marginally legible due to small, broken print.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education; Chinese; Elementary Education; Language Skills; Mathematics; Multicultural Education; *Parent Participation; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Reading Achievement; Self Concept; Spanish Speaking; *Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS	*Bilingual Education Act 1968; *District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VII program instituted by the public schools of the District of Columbia serves approximately 1600 students in 14 elementary school sites and includes both Spanish/English and Chinese/English components. This evaluation report details the progress of Title VII bilingual education towards meeting program goals in the areas of instruction, staff development, and parent/community involvement. Included in the evaluation are procedures and lists of instruments used to collect data; an overall project evaluation plan; a description of the project, including its staffing; data from pre and post testing of a sample of project students; data from staff development activities; and data from parent/community participation activities. The instructional component evaluation consists primarily of measures of skills development in reading, mathematics, language, and self concept (including multicultural awareness). Evaluation instruments are appended to the report. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

AUG 11 1980

ED191963

CHESS
and Associates, Inc.
Cultural and Humanistic Educational Systems and Services
2759 STEEPLECHASE LANE, DIAMOND BAR, CA 91765

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR THE 1978 - 1979 TITLE VII BILINGUAL PROJECT PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Cooper
D.C. Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD020901

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR THE

1978 - 1979

TITLE VII BILINGUAL PROJECT

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON

Presented to: Public Schools of D.C.
Division of Bilingual Education
Gordon Junior High School
35th and "T" Streets, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

Prepared by: CHESS and Associates, Inc.
Educational Systems and Services
2759 Steeplechase Lane
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Contract Grant: No. 047-AA-NS-0-9-GA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Description of Program 5

Evaluation Design 7

Instructional Components 9

Support Components 25

Commendations and Recommendations 30

Appendix 33

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of this Bilingual Education project involves all systematic efforts of the project to assess the strengths and weaknesses of its activities and to determine their utility in the realization of established project objectives for the 1979-1980 school year. As such, evaluation must necessarily be a cyclical process that continuously aids in determining project progress and success, and whose basic purpose is to improve existing instructional programs through informed decision-making. Evaluation is thus a formal program of collecting, analyzing, comparing and judging relevant information, which can then be fed to personnel responsible for planning and implementing any program improvements.

Both formative and summative evaluation techniques are intended for use in determining program success in the attainment of establish objectives. The formative evaluation views and judges project activities during the implementation phases and thus permits feedback to project personnel who are to revise and adjust the program at interim points to optimize resource allocation and goal achievement. The summative evaluation assess the degree to which project objectives were attained and provided a measure of the overall success of the program. This Final Report summarizes the summative findings.

The evaluation effort has focused on both process and product. Examination and evaluation of the project products enable determination of the net results; for example, in terms of type of materials produced or changes in performance of pupils participating in the project. However, product evaluation is only part of the evaluation cycle; process evaluation provides the means for determining the effectiveness of implemented activities, which certainly and critically impact on overally project success.

Certainly an essential step in the evaluation process is the reporting of evaluation results to decision-makers in the most technically sound, efficient and relevant manner possible. A formal mechanism is therefore

provided for this feedback system to operate, so that timely, meaningful and accurate information is provided to Program Administrators, Staff and the Parent Advisory Committee.

The critical factor in a comprehensive evaluation design is that of providing information which is sufficiently timely and relevant, so that individuals and groups concerned with the program are able to make informed recommendations and decisions. Evaluation activities must therefore be planned on logical bases, consistent with the overall project objective, prior to the implementation of the program itself. The evaluation plan is a means of guiding evaluation activities in a manner coordinated with the project activities, yet providing sufficient flexibility in the event the evaluation results indicate the necessity of program changes.

The evaluation process began with the selection of evaluation personnel, the use of outside evaluation specialists to conduct the evaluation. These specialists were selected based upon proven capability in the areas of Bilingual Education and Program Evaluation. Such specialists can determine the most effective approach to conduct the evaluation in terms of providing relevant decision-making information to project personnel.

In consideration of the project requirements, a detailed activity and time schedule was developed to reflect the phasing of evaluation activities with the project efforts. The various aspects of evaluation responsibility were carefully delineated and explicitly assigned to appropriate personnel. Of key importance to the utility of the evaluation effort was the comprehension of project personnel of the purpose of project evaluation in general, the intent of the evaluation design, the instruments to be used and the evaluation data collection requirements and timelines.

The scope of evaluation activities must be in accord with the various project components. The evaluation areas for this project concern the elements of instruction, staff development and parent/community involvement. Evaluation in the instruction component consists primarily of measuring the development

of skills in English and Spanish in the following areas: Reading, Math, Language Development, and self-concept. The focus within the staff development component is determining the effectiveness of the In-service Training Program in enhancing the abilities of teachers and instructional aides to attain the objectives of the instructional component. Finally, evaluation in the parent/community components of the project is concerned with measuring the effectiveness of Washington D.C. in educating, attracting, and retaining parent and community involvement in school activities.

The report which follows details the project's progress towards meeting its goals as related to the Title VII Project Proposal and the Title VII Guidelines. Included are procedures and lists of instruments used to collect data, an overall project evaluation plan, description of the project including its staffing, data from pre and post testing of a sample project students, data from staff development activities and data from parent/community participation activities.

A variety of instruments and methods have been used to collect data, including standardized tests, criterion-referenced checklists, observation checklists and activity logs. The results of these are summarized in each component's section. Conclusions and recommendations are also presented at the end of this report. This Final Report summarizes the Summative Evaluation of the Public Schools of D.C. Title VII Bilingual Program for the 1978-1979 school year. The report on the formative aspect of the evaluation was presented previously but it is included here as part of the appendix.

The evaluation team of CHESS and Associates, Inc. wishes to thank the Project Director and the Project Staff for their cooperation in the evaluation process and its activities. It is hoped that the results of this evaluation report will provide valuable input for continued progress and development of Bilingual Education in the Public Schools of D.C.

DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

Description of Program

The Title VII program instituted by the Public Schools of the District of Columbia consists of approximately 1580 students at 14 sites. The program consists of two components a Spanish/English component and a Chinese/English component at Thomson School.

Six of the schools examined in this study: Bancroft, Cooke, Eaton, Hyde, Murch and Thomson schools, have partial bilingual programs. This consists of an intensive individualized instructional program. During a portion of the day the students received intensive instruction in English with respect to reading, Math and other academic subjects from a bilingual teacher and/or aide.

The students at Oyster school participated in a full bilingual program. Approximately 350 students participated in the program. The program consists of two full time teachers in each class both of whom are bilingual. The classes contain students who are fluent English speakers as well as limited and non-English speaking students. All students participate in the bilingual program for the entire day.

EVALUATION DESIGN

EVALUATION DESIGN

A 25% random sample of students served by the bilingual program in each of the seven project schools and who had taken the English version of the CTBS at the beginning of the year were selected to take the Spanish version of the CTBS. Spanish and English versions of this test were used to analyze student progress in Reading and Math. Ninety-nine first through sixth grade students received pre and post scores on the Reading and Math sections of the English version. The CTBS English and Spanish tests were administered on the following dates:

CTBS English, grades 3 and 6, October 78 and May 79
CTBS English, grades 1, 2, 4, and 5, October 78 and June 79
CTBS Spanish, grades 1 through 6, January 79 and June 79

Eighty-eight 1st-6th grade students received pre and post test scores on the Spanish version. Eleven students received scores only on the English version.

The numbers of students in each grade level were generally too small to provide a representative sampling. Thus the data (where possible) has been aggregated over the entire scope of the project. Even though the CTBS uses different levels at each grade level, the levels are standardized; thus enabling comparisons across levels. However, the data available at each grade level is helpful in identifying the level of proficiency of the students.

In addition to analyzing the progress of the aggregate, an analysis has been conducted involving a comparison of the partial and total bilingual programs.

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENTS

READING

Table I summarizes the performance of the students for Reading in both Spanish and English in terms of grade equivalent scores. The Spanish reading results indicate that the students in grades 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 achieved pre and post scores which were at or above grade level. The results of the sixth grade suggest regression occurred with respect to their Spanish reading ability. However, the number of students involved in the testing was too small for a more detailed determination of loss. Overall the 88 students involved in the Spanish Reading testing program were able to improve their Spanish reading skills by the equivalent of seven months of instruction between the pre and post tests.

The English Reading results indicate that the students in grades 1, 2 and 3 were able to achieve English reading skills commensurate with their grade levels. The students in grades 4, 5 and 6 achieved English reading skills which were less than their grade levels. Overall, the students were able to improve their English Reading skills by the equivalent of seven months of instruction between the pre and post tests.

The above suggest that the students may be slightly more proficient in Spanish Reading than they are in reading English. Nine first and second grade students involved in the testing were in the Chinese program, thus only English data was available for them.

To determine if statistically significant growth occurred among the program's students, the test scores were transformed into standard scores. Table II summarizes those results. Overall, statistically significant gains were registered for both English and Spanish Reading. Specifically, statistically significant gains were achieved in grades 1, 2 and 5 in English Reading and grades 1, 2, 3 and 5 in Spanish Reading. There were no statistically significant gains or losses in grades 3, 4 and 6 for English Reading and grades 4 and 6 for Spanish Reading. The number of students involved in grades 3 and 6 are too few to be meaningful.

TABLE I

CTBS Grade Equivalent Results for Reading

CTBS Reading (Spanish)

Grade	#	Vocabulary			Reading Comprehension			Total Reading		
		Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.
1	23	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.7	2.0	.3
2	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0	3.3	1.3
3	11	3.1	4.6	1.5	3.1	4.1	1.0	3.1	4.6	1.5
4	18	4.6	5.1	.5	4.2	4.4	.2	4.3	4.7	.4
5	9	4.6	6.6	2.0	4.0	5.7	1.7	4.3	6.0	1.7
6	8	6.4	6.6	.2	5.5	5.0	-.5	6.0	5.6	-.4
Total	88	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.0	3.7	.7

CTBS Reading (English)

Grade	#	Vocabulary			Reading Comprehension			Total Reading		
		Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.
1	28	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.3	1.8	.5
2	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.9	2.9	1.0
3	6	3.5	4.3	.8	3.4	3.5	.1	3.4	3.8	.4
4	15	2.8	3.0	.2	3.4	3.4	-.4	3.3	3.2	-.1
5	11	3.7	5.2	1.5	4.1	5.1	5.1	4.0	5.3	1.3
6	4	4.3	4.3	0.0	4.5	4.0	-.5	4.4	4.2	-.2
Total	82	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.1	2.8	.7

TABLE II

CTBS English Reading

Grade	#	Pre		Post		Difference	
		Mean *	Std.Dev.	Mean *	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1	28	213.53	39.71	263.73	31.01	50.19	28.68 **
2	18	278.22	45.67	335.95	47.65	57.73	30.64 **
3	6	366.83	58.04	386.17	46.96	19.34	49.75
4	15	357.07	56.81	351.00	27.82	-6.07	47.16
5	11	392.91	47.36	443.09	40.03	50.18	27.83 **
6	4	411.75	54.14	401.00	67.92	-10.75	21.88
Total	82	298.94	87.31	335.27	72.96	36.32	43.03 **

CTBS Spanish Reading

Grade	#	Pre		Post		Difference	
		Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1	23	257.17	27.71	287.44	23.03	30.26	51.05 **
2	19	293.63	47.35	361.42	49.45	67.72	12.72 **
3	11	347.00	57.46	404.64	33.85	57.64	46.39 **
4	18	405.11	45.47	421.33	60.82	16.22	48.48
5	9	408.11	62.38	468.22	45.01	60.11	56.64 **
6	8	465.38	35.96	454.13	28.38	-11.25	20.53
Total	88	340.99	84.08	379.09	76.68	47.21	42.99 **

*Mean scores are reported as standardized scores
**Statistically significant gain at .05 level

MATHEMATICS

Table III summarizes the performance of the students for Mathematics on both the Spanish and English versions in terms of grade equivalent scores. The Spanish Math results indicate that the students in grades 4, 5 and 6 achieved math skills which were slightly less than grade level. The students in grade 1, 2 and 3 achieved math skills that were equivalent to one year or more than grade level. Overall, the 88 students involved in the Spanish Math testing program were able to improve their math skills by the equivalent of seven months of instruction between pre and post tests.

The English Math results were similar, with the students in grades 1, 2 and 3 achieved math skills that were equivalent to one year or more than grade level. The students in grades 4 and 5 achieved less than grade level skills. There were too few sixth grade students for meaningful results. Overall, the students were able to improve their math skills by the equivalent of eight months of instruction.

To determine if statistically significant growth occurred among the program's students, the test scores were transformed into standardized scores (Table IV). Overall, statistically significant gains were made on both the English and Spanish Math tests. Specifically the students in grades 1, 2, 3 and 5 achieved statistically significant gains on both the English and Spanish versions of the CTBS Math tests. However, the students in fourth grade achieved no gain on the Spanish Math test, and achieved a significantly negative change on the English Math test. These results indicate that the students made good progress in the aquisition of math skills.

TABLE III

CTBS Grade Equivalent Results for Mathematics

CTBS English Math

Grade	#	Math Computation			Math Concepts			Math Application			Total Math		
		Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.
1	28	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	.7	2.2	1.5
2	18	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.0	3.0	1.0
3	6	3.6	4.4	.8	3.6	5.4	1.8	3.6	4.3	.7	3.7	4.7	1.0
4	15	4.7	3.5	-1.2	3.9	3.1	-.8	3.3	3.0	-.3	4.1	3.3	-.8
5	11	4.5	5.9	1.4	3.6	5.1	1.5	4.1	4.8	.7	4.2	5.4	1.2
6	4	6.4	7.2	.8	5.1	7.1	2.0	5.9	7.1	1.2	6.0	7.3	1.3
Total	82	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.5	3.3	.8

CTBS Spanish Math

Grade	#	Math Computation			Math Concepts			Math Application			Total Math		
		Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.	Pre	Post	Diff.
1	23	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.7	2.2	.5
2	19	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.3	3.1	.8
3	11	3.1	4.5	1.4	3.8	4.4	.6	3.3	4.7	1.4	3.2	4.8	1.6
4	18	4.5	4.7	.2	4.1	3.9	-.2	4.0	4.1	.1	4.3	4.4	.1
5	9	4.9	5.7	.8	5.5	5.8	.3	4.0	5.5	1.5	4.6	5.5	.9
6	8	5.7	6.2	.5	5.4	6.3	.9	6.6	6.6	0.0	5.9	6.3	.4
Total	88	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.9	3.6	.7

TABLE IV

CTBS Spanish Math

Grade	#	Pre		Post		Difference	
		Mean*	Std.Dev.	Mean*	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1	23	261.34	28.83	288.39	26.29	27.04	26.26
2	19	291.94	24.99	332.63	22.90	40.61	27.61
3	11	337.64	39.33	396.27	65.74	58.64	63.28 **
4	18	383.39	38.96	385.78	48.91	2.39	30.42
5	9	392.44	46.98	427.22	63.29	34.78	43.46 **
6	8	442.88	34.98	453.75	35.47	10.88	15.96 **
Total	88	332.36	69.86	360.58	70.08	28.74	39.24 **

CTBS English Math

Grade	#	Pre		Post		Difference	
		Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1	28	214.29	37.14	285.95	27.47	71.64	37.55 **
2	18	273.39	34.83	328.00	35.73	54.61	26.98 **
3	6	362.50	37.27	393.67	37.03	31.17	20.00 **
4	15	375.53	28.02	343.40	31.02	-32.13	31.18 **
5	11	379.27	38.02	425.82	43.45	46.55	29.67 **
6	4	445.5	44.02	482.75	86.31	37.25	49.50
Total	82	301.02	84.49	341.93	68.20	40.91	49.37 **

*Mean scores are reported as standardized scores
**Statistically significant at .05 level

Analysis Between Students in Oyster School and Other Bilingual Students in The Washington D.C. Title VII Project

As indicated in the description of the Project there were two types of programs in existance in the Washington D.C. Title VII project. At Oyster school the students participated in a full bilingual program. The other schools in the sample instituted a partial bilingual program.

A total of 82 students in grades 1-6 received pre and post test on the English version of the CTBS. Of these 82 students 38 students were from Oyster school and 44 students were from one of the other six sampled schools with bilingual programs. However in conducting the overall comparison between the two programs grades 3 and 6 were not included. This resulted because in grade 3 complete data were available only for Oyster students. At grade 6 there were complete data for only 4 students at Oyster and 3 students at the other schools. Thus a total of 72 students were used to compare the types of programs.

A total of 88 students in grades 1-6 received pre and post tests on the Spanish version of the CTBS. Of these 88 students 43 students were from Oyster and 45 students were from one of the other six sampled schools with bilingual programs.

Table V summarizes the test scores for the English version of the CTBS for the 72 Oyster students and other bilingual students in grades 1, 2, 4 and 5.

As can be seen with respect to the pre tests, first grade on the math test and the 4th grade on the reading test there were significant differences between the two groups. In both cases the students not in the Oyster school achieved higher scores. Overall, there was no apparent difference on either test. Thus the groups began the year at equivalent levels.

There were no significant differences with respect to their performance on the post tests in Reading or Math at any grade level. This indicates that the students in the two groups achieved the same level of performance in Reading and Math at the end of the year. With respect to the gains of the students during the year, there were significantly greater gains in grades 1st and 4th

in Reading and 5 in Math. The students not in Oyster school achieved greater gains in the first grade in Reading and 5th grade in Math. In the fourth grade the Oyster students achieved greater gain in Reading than those students in the other bilingual programs. However, overall there was no significant difference in the amount of gain from pre to post tests.

Table VI summarizes the scores for the Spanish version of the CTBS of 88 Oyster bilingual students and bilingual students from other schools in grades 1-6. As can be seen with respect to the pre-test there were statistically significant differences in grade 1 in reading and grade 4 in reading and math. On the first grade reading pre-test, the Oyster students achieved higher scores than the bilingual students at other schools. On the pre-tests in reading and math for the fourth grade the students in the other bilingual schools achieved higher scores than the bilingual students sampled at Oyster school. Combining the scores from all grades it is apparent that there is no significant difference between the two groups on the Reading and Math pre-tests.

On the post-test there were statistically significant differences in reading in grades 3, 4 and 5. The Oyster bilingual students in grades 3 and 4 achieved higher scores than the bilingual students in other schools, while the other students in grade 5 achieved higher scores than the Oyster students in Spanish Reading. Combining the scores from all grades it can be seen that there was no significant difference between the two groups.

On the math post-test there were significant differences in grades 3, 4 and 5. The students in grade three at Oyster achieved greater math scores than the other students, while the other students in grades 4 and 5 achieved higher post-test math scores than the Oyster students. However, there was no significant difference overall in math between the two groups.

With respect to the gains of the students, there were statistically significant gains in the third grade in reading and grades 3 and 5 in Math. On both tests the third grade students at Oyster achieved greater gains than the other students; while the other students achieved statistically greater gains in math than the Oyster students. However, again there was no difference in the amount of gain achieved by either group.

The test results for both reading and Math on both versions of the CTBS, suggest that the students are performing equally well in both types of bilingual programs.

TABLE Va

Oyster Bilingual Program vs. other Bilingual Programs

CTBS English Version

		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Oyster (12)	Other (16)	Oyster (7)	Other (11)	Oyster (6)	Other (0)
				READING			
	Mean	220.5	208.30	276.91	279.18	366.83	---------
Pre	Std.Dev.	44.10	35.17	28.91	53.65	58.04	---------
	T-value	.815		-.111			
	Mean	256.42	269.20	332.57	338.10	386.17	---------
Post	Std.Dev.	27.66	32.24	36.52	53.56	46.96	---------
	T-value	-1.100		-.239			
	Mean	35.92	60.89	55.86	58.92	19.34	---------
Diff	Std.Dev.	29.00	23.27	30.24	30.83	49.75	---------
	T-value	-2.530		-.207			
				MATH			
	Mean	200.25	224.82	270.71	275.10	362.50	---------
Pre	Std.Dev.	40.57	30.34	7.52	44.06	37.27	---------
	T-value	-1.840*		-.258			
	Mean	279.50	290.75	324.43	330.27	393.67	---------
Post	Std.Dev.	29.37	24.89	35.51	35.68	37.03	---------
	T-value	-1.096		-.339			
	Mean	79.25	65.93	53.71	55.17	31.17	---------
Diff	Std.Dev.	46.07	28.28	33.94	21.38	20.00	---------
	T-value	.946		-.113			

*Significant at .05 level

**Grades 3 and 6 are not included.

TABLE Vb

Oyster Bilingual Program vs. Other Bilingual Programs

CTBS English Version

		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Total	
		Oyster (9)	Other (6)	Oyster (4)	Other (7)	Oyster (0)	Other (4)	Oyster (32)	Other (40
					Reading				
	Mean	325.22	404.85	404.75	386.14	----------	465.38	285.38	288.40
Pre	Std.Dev.	52.02	14.33	24.55	55.27		35.96	74.64	89.97
	T-value	-2.934*		.628				-.157	
	Mean	341.44	365.34	447.50	440.57	----------	454.13	320.88	332.56
Post	Std.Dev.	27.48	21.47	25.93	41.97	----------	28.38	68.25	73.58
	T-value	-1.549		.276				-.692	
Diff.	Mean	16.22	-39.51	42.75	54.43	----------	-11.25	35.60	44.16
	Std.Dev.	49.15	8.57	15.16	32.19	----------	20.53	37.86	43.71
	T-value	2.798*		-.673				-.876	
					Math				
	Mean	369.22	385.00	376.50	380.85	----------	442.88	285.22	289.97
Pre	Std.Dev.	24.93	42.59	23.90	39.10	----------	34.98	81.58	77.46
	T-value	.661		-.200				-.253	
	Mean	339.78	348.83	405.00	437.72	----------	453.75	321.97	336.05
Post	Std.Dev.	27.70	37.72	22.39	39.23	----------	35.47	49.74	61.19
	T-value	-.409		-1.511				-1.052	
	Mean	-29.44	-36.17	28.5	56.86	----------	10.88	36.75	46.07
Diff	Std.Dev.	31.61	30.08	10.26	13.79	----------	15.96	58.96	42.77
	T-value	.340		-3.560*				-.783	

*Significant at .05 level

**Grades 3 and 6 are not included.

TABLE VI

Oyster Bilingual Program vs. Other Bilingual Programs

CTBS Spanish Version

		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3	
		Oyster (13)	Other (10)	Oyster (9)	Other (12)	Oyster (6)	Other (5)
				Reading			
	Mean	266.92	244.50	314.71	281.33	342.83	352.00
Pre	Std.Dev.	25.97	24.60	28.05	51.71	67.72	37.21
	T-value	2.099*		.328		-.284	
	Mean	287.77	287.00	377.57	352.00	423.00	382.60
Post	Std.Dev	25.82	18.78	38.88	52.43	25.97	28.65
	T-value	.078		1.118		2.453*	
	Mean	20.85	42.50	62.86	70.67	80.17	30.60
Diff.	Std.Dev.	16.97	73.14	18.10	63.54	48.45	04.05
	T-value	-1.038		-.314		2.07*	
				Math			
	Mean	255.77	268.60	292.14	291.83	335.33	340.4
Pre	Std.Dev.	34.92	15.27	18.93	27.92	35.69	43.14
	T-value	-1.081		.026		.214	
	Mean	286.31	287.20	330.00	334.17	432.17	353.2
Post	Std.Dev.	29.22	20.77	15.16	39.67	60.00	42.26
	T-value	.191		-.264		3.74*	
	Mean	33.54	18.60	37.86	42.33	96.83	12.80
Diff.	Std.Dev.	29.22	18.71	10.80	33.64	63.99	6.55
	T-value	1.406		-.338		2.65*	

*Statistically significant at .05 level.

TABLE VIb

Oyster Bilingual Program vs. Other Bilingual Programs

CTBS Spanish Version

		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Total	
		Oyster (8)	Other (10)	Oyster (5)	Other (4)	Oyster (4)	Other (4)	Oyster (43)	Other (4)
Reading									
	Mean	374.64	429.50	380.00	443.25	479.00	451.75	338.21	343.46
Pre	Std.Dev.	39.01	34.15	58.43	47.60	39.06	26.25	75.61	91.16
	T-value	-3.182*		-1.744		1.158		-.293	
	Mean	392.88	444.10	443.20	499.50	459.50	448.75	374.86	383.13
Post	Std.Dev.	47.83	60.57	33.70	37.11	25.55	30.00	71.05	81.50
	T-value	-1.952*		-2.384*		.546		-.078	
	Mean	18.25	14.6	63.20	56.25	-19.50	-3.00	36.65	39.67
Diff	Std.Dev.	47.22	46.98	69.67	33.54	28.89	6.04	49.14	59.31
	T-value	.163		.182		-1.118		-.259	
Math									
	Mean	364.25	398.7	384.80	40.15	451.25	434.50	326.16	338.24
Pre	Std.Dev.	32.12	37.15	45.53	46.39	31.96	35.85	70.40	68.72
	T-value	-2.07*		-.542		.698		-.815	
	Mean	364.63	40.27	396.6	465.5	453.75	453.75	357.65	363.38
Post	Std.Dev.	47.57	43.02	43.73	63.12	27.15	42.17	69.83	71.85
	T-value	-1.781*		-1.941*		.000		-.379	
	Mean	.38	4.00	11.80	64.00	2.50	19.25	31.49	25.14
Diff	Std.Dev.	23.16	35.09	38.73	28.94	12.60	14.79	45.21	33.07
	T-value	-.251		-2.233*		-1.740		.754	

*Statistically significant at .05 level

CULTURAL AWARENESS

A total of 47 students were assessed with the Attitude Inventory for Multicultural Sensitivity (AIMS) to determine the students' attitudes toward themselves and others. The inventory consists of three sections. The first section provides a set of descriptive words which the students are to use to identify their feeling toward themselves. The same descriptors are used in the second section in which the students are to identify their feelings about others. The final section consists of a set of questions to determine the students' level of acceptance of other cultures.

Twenty-two students in grades 3-6 from Oyster School were assessed with the AIMS as well as 25 students in grades 3-6 from Murch, Hyde, Eaton, Cooke and Thomson Schools. The results of the assessment are summarized in Table VII.

The AIMS has not been normed, so conclusions concerning the degree of multicultural sensitivity must be based in relation to the total possible points assignable on the inventory. To that end it seems as though the students have relatively good views of themselves and others. While not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that the view the students have of others is slightly higher than the view they have of themselves. (Sections I and II). The level of acceptance of other cultures also seems to be relatively high.

Comparing the students from Oyster School (which has a full bilingual program) with the students from the other five schools (which have only a partial bilingual program) reveals that both groups have essentially the same view of themselves and others. However, there is a statistically significant difference between the two groups with respect to their acceptance of others. The students in the partial bilingual programs seem to have a slightly higher level of acceptance of other cultures than the students in the full bilingual program. There was no difference on the total inventory score between the two groups.

TABLE VII

Self and Multicultural Awareness

			Section I	Section II	Section III	Total
Total Possible			6	6	20	32
Group	#					
Oyster	22	% correct:	68%	69	81	76
		Mean:	4.09	4.14	16.23	24.45
		Std.Dev.:	1.65	1.22	3.12	4.93
Others	25	% correct:	67	67	89	81
		Mean:	4.00	4.04	17.72	25.76
		Std.Dev.:	1.65	1.51	2.16	4.14
Total	47	% correct:	67	68	85	79
		Mean:	4.04	4.09	17.02	25.15
		Std.Dev.:	1.60	1.38	2.72	4.57

SUPPORT COMPONENTS

PARENTS AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

A survey was developed to ascertain the degree of parent and community acceptance of the Title VII Bilingual program and to what extent the parents and community were involved in the program's activities. The survey was returned by fifteen parents and nine community members. All the returns were from parents and community representatives involved in the Spanish program. In fact, all the surveys were returned using the Spanish version.

Eighty percent of the parents indicated that they were very active in the PTA and other advisory committee meetings. Only 11% of the community representatives indicated that they were very active in such activities. The remaining 89% of the community representatives responding to this questionnaire indicated that they were only moderately active or not at all active in these activities.

Seventy-four percent of the parents indicated that they were very active in participating in the various school activities such as parent/teacher conferences, attending school plays etc. Thirty-three percent of the community representatives indicated that they were very active in participating in the school activities.

Eighty percent of the parents indicated that school personnel made a great effort to inform parents of activities related to the Title VII program. Forty-four percent of the community representatives also felt that school personnel made a great effort in informing them of program events.

Eighty-six percent of the parents felt that the community coordinators were very effective in assisting parents to adjust to a new environment. Fifty-six percent of the community representatives agreed with this assessment.

Sixty-seven percent of the parents indicated that the community coordinators were very effective in providing them with continuous information about the

Title VII program. Forty-four percent of the community representatives also felt the community coordinators were very effective in providing them with continuous information about the Title VII program.

The parents felt that the community coordinators did a good job in helping parents; 40% of the parents responding to the provided questionnaire actually received assistance from the community coordinators. Overall 60% of the parents did not respond to this question. Eighty-seven percent of the parents and 44% of the community representatives were contacted at one time or another by the community coordinators, by phone, letter, or home visits. This reinterates the parents feelings that the community coordinators were effective in their efforts.

The returns of the survey were rather limited and therefore a sound valid assessment of the parent program is difficult. Based on the results, however, it may be stated that the parents are pleased with the program. The general community is represented by the parents who attend Sunday monthly meetings. Parents and the community representatives do seem to be well informed about the program. The entire groups who are community representatives feel that the community coordinators are an asset to the program.

The results obtained through this limited survey reinforce the evaluator's general impression of effectiveness of the parent involvement program.
(See appendix for a summary of the Interim Report.)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

TITLE VII

During the life of this project, a comprehensive staff development program has accomplished the following:

1) Out of 10 bilingual aides assigned to the Title VII program:
   a) Five have become teachers in the D.C. Public School System with degrees in bilingual education.
   b) Two bilingual teacher aides have completed four years and are now eligible for certification as bilingual teachers.
   c) One bilingual teacher has completed three years toward a B.A. degree in bilingual education.
   d) The remaining two aides did not wish to attend the University.
2) Approximately 75 teachers have received training in bilingual education from resource teachers; this effort has led in several cases to recertification credit.
3) Nine teachers took courses to satisfy certification requirements.

In addition to summarizing the activities for staff development, a survey was developed and distributed to the teachers in the Title VII program. Eleven teachers responded to the survey. All eleven indicated that they had received some form of instruction from the Bilingual Resource team. The median number of sessions attended by these teachers were 2. Ninety-one percent of the teachers indicated that these sessions were helpful in providing bilingual instruction to their students. The teachers indicated that these workshops aided them most in the following four areas:

1) instruction of the bilingual/bicultural student
2) utilization of materials
3) innovation techniques
4) cultural awareness

The inservice program, therefore, was aimed at a broad spectrum of issues. This appears to be very useful to the teachers.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

TITLE VII

A survey was distributed to the teachers involved in the Bilingual program to determine the effectiveness of the instructional materials available to them. Only four of the teachers responded, thus the results provide only a limited view of the effectiveness of the program.

For most part, teachers seemed to feel that the instructional materials they need were available to them. The materials which were available provided their students with appropriate stimuli.

The teachers also felt that the needed diagnostic instruments were available to assess student needs. They seemed satisfied with these instruments in terms of their ability to place students and diagnose students' skills.

However, while the teachers seem generally satisfied with what they have they feel that better materials are available or need to be developed.

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A series of commendations and recommendations were made in the report submitted as part of the formative evaluation. A copy of it may be found in the appendix.

The results of the CTBS Reading and Math tests which were given in both English and Spanish indicate that good progress has been made. The overall results indicate that during their participation in the Title VII Program the students were able to achieve the equivalent of seven months growth. While only a sample it appeared to be representative of all students in the program, yet, the numbers of students at each grade level were generally too small to be representative of the performance for each grade. In addition to examining overall growth of the Title VII students a comparison was made between the students involved in the full bilingual programs and those involved in the partial bilingual programs. The overall test results show no differences between the groups on the pre tests, post tests or gains for reading and math in either English or Spanish.

It is interesting to note that no differences occured between the two programs, in full bilingual and partial bilingual. However, it must be pointed out that the results of the full bilingual project probably included students who were classified as Fluent English speakers. While the results of the partial programs included no scores from Fluent English Speakers. Further analysis of these programs is recommended, to include a comparison of initial language proficiencies.

It is to be noted that the activities observed during the formative evaluation period actually contributed to the students' academic growth.

The program also needs to be commended for assisting the instructional staff to continue their academic growth and in several cases to make possible the completion of career ladder programs culminating in aides obtaining teaching credentials.

Since there is always room for improvement it is recommended that in the future, program objectives be more explicit in the expected outcomes.

The effectiveness of the parent education program is highly commendable. It is recommended that the efforts made to date to involve parents and community continue to be strengthened in order to maintain the on-going participation and involvement by the community being served by the program.

It is also recommended that the program, which is now institutionalized, continue to work closely with the surrounding Institutions of Higher Education in order to provide continuous academic growth in bilingual education to the instructional staff of the district. In this manner, all students may profit from the newly developed knowledge to be acquired in this area by teachers, administrators and aides.

APPENDIX

WASHINGTON D.C. INTERIM REPORT

Although the evaluation specifications called for an early beginning (close to the initiation of the school year), of the formative process, due to the teachers' strike and other causes beyond anyone's control, the first visit to the project by the evaluators took place from April 30, to May 1, 1979.

A second visit took place during the same month between May 16 and May 20, 1979. This extended visit permitted the evaluation team to observe not only classrooms but also parent training and parent involvement.

Two other visits were made as follows: One on June 13 for the purpose of organizing the data collection, and the last one on July 23 and July 24 to interview administrative staff and review the content for the first draft of the Interim Report.

During the first visit the evaluators had the opportunity of meeting with district personnel whose main responsibility is research and evaluation. After a productive meeting, where the pre-test data collection program was explained, much of the existing data, at that point, was received by the evaluator. This visit permitted the latter to visit all of the schools in the program, to become acquainted with the program's staff, as well as to set up a schedule of meeting for the following visits.

During the first three-day visit, the evaluation team, consisting of Drs. Hortensia Hernandez and Alba Moesser, was able to observe several Bilingual classes in progress. Some classes were being conducted in Spanish while others were having ESL or were being conducted in English.

All visited classes where Spanish and English were being taught had two teachers, with each Masters Degrees. One teacher served as an English model and the other as a Spanish model. Both of these were native speakers in the model language. By using two native speakers (one English and one Spanish) as models, the students seem to more clearly identify language differences and take pride in demonstrating to each teacher their continuous progress. Also it was evident that each teacher can concentrate more closely into specific teaching areas. The classes were (with the exception of the Chinese group observed) very heterogenous in ethnic composition. The incorporation of the children's culture in the curriculum was very evident. The English teacher, for example, in a science period, was addressing the treatment of aniamals according to the American way. During a Spanish language development lesson, students recognize as most common among Hispanics to go to different stores to purchase foods such as one place to go for meat, another for bread, another for milk, et cetera.

The students in the classes observed were highly motivated and seemed to be relaxed and at ease. Class participation was good and all wanted to contribute. Many children were bilingual. Several of them had in fact entered the program as monolingual English speakers; therefore, in many cases, the teachers did not need any effort to communicate their ideas in Spanish. It was noted that the children of the staff at one of the schools were also participating in the program. There was a second grade class in which the children were reading cursive

writing in Spanish and dealing with prefixes and suffixes with a great deal of confidence. This particular lesson was integrated in a social studies lesson entitled, "gente de la comunidad." The Spanish language program for many of the children is a maintenance program.

The Project Director accompanied the members of the evaluation team on most of the visits; he demonstrated an outstanding rapport with all the students in all schools, knowing them in many cases by their first name. The classes were set to allow all students to receive individualized instruction addressed to their particular needs. The individualization observed was specific; for example, a student having difficulties with specific language area would receive sometime during the class period, direct and individual assistance form the teacher.

No definitive scope and sequence or curriculum was observed being utilized by the classroom teachers. Observed, however, was a great cohesiveness among the bilingual teachers in their efforts to offer students a continuous program. Based on informal interviews, the evaluators learned that teachers are not supportive of the system presently employed to obtain instructional materials.

The evaluation team met with the teachers during their lunch hour and after school. As a result of these meetings it was learned there is unity among teachers with regard to the curriculum being offered. The perennial need for materials seems to be enhanced by the difficult process existing in the final purchase of texts.

It was also learned that most of the teachers holding an MA in bilingual education have obtained it under the auspices of the program and several are presently

participating in a similar effort. It is interesting to note that several aides began as parents volunteering in the program, but more noteworthy is the fact that two aides have obtained their teaching credential under the program's traineeship.

One of the highlights in the project is the parents' education program. Each Saturday morning there are classes for parents offered at different levels, from simple instruction of the English language to methodology of several subjects in English and/or Spanish. During a Saturday (May 19, 1979) the evaluation team observed several of these classes. A number of those participating in the classes were interviewed. They all expressed great satisfaction with the program. One of the points constantly remarked upon was the fact that parents were being taught by their children's teachers. This contributed to the build-up of rapport between adults which in turn may be most beneficial to the children. There is a special budget to pay these parents for each attendance; however, many members of the family and community are auditing the classes even without being paid. The same rapport observed between the Project Director and the students was also evident between him and the parents.

The parents' advisory committee, which meets monthly on Sunday afternoons, was also observed by the evaluation team. Since the project will conduct a survey among the parents and the members of the PAC, interviews with those attending the meeting were rather informal and candid. Again, the evaluator found much satisfaction and certain anxiety about the fact that the District's summer program would not have the bilingual emphasis which they felt was needed.

The organization of the PAC was impressive. The minutes of the previous meeting and the resolutions reflected in them regarding the following meeting were obviously being implemented.

Another aspect of the program deals with the Chinese-English languages. There are 285-300 Chinese students distributed among Thomson Elementary, Wilson High and Alice Deal Jr. High School. The Chinese students' classes obsevered were composed in most cases of recently-arrived children. The teachers' main concern was to introduce them to the English language and culture. Although the evaluator could not communicate well with the students, they did not seem pressured or unhappy. The instruction was highly individualized due to the different Chinese dialects in which the children were fluent; the program itself is transitional in nature.

During the last two visit by the evaluators, interviews were conducted among the administrative staff. Through this process it was learned that the resource teachers make provisions for individual instruction to students identified by teachers as needing a great deal of one-to-one instruction. The resource teachers employ a great deal of time and effort locating volunteers. One of their main sources is the volunteers' Clearing House located in Washington D.C. Another is based on research. The resource teachers keep abreast of the area's various Universities' requirements, which may include field experience. Once a field experience program is identified, if it is related to bilingual education--be it by the need to practice the teaching of a second language such as English, Spanish or Chinese, or the implementation of certain teaching methods--the resource teacher contacts the University, identifies the students participating in the program and distributes a questionnaire which attempts to determine the student's interest in participating as a volunteer in the Washington D.C. Bilingual Program. This process is sometimes used with other agencies.

An important "on the job" task performed by the resource teachers is that of public relations. This is clearly understood when it is considered that their search for volunteers alone takes them often to the general public.

In relation to materials for teachers it is the resource teachers' position that the smoothness and great desire of the teachers to work cooperatively and in agreement regarding the curriculum stems from the high individualism among teachers. This seems contradictory if it is recognized that the lack of apparent scope and sequence in the bilingual program is due to the fact that teachers have not been able to agree on selecting a basic instructional series. Yet this incongruency has contributed to the maintenance of constant communication among the instructional staff. Still, to have a sound program, the resource teachers have worked cooperatively with teachers in the development to present of a K-3 curriculum.

The resource teachers also address the difficult process to obtain materials which requires a testing and evaluation period. Also they explained that the contract with suppliers stipulates that they "shall first send to the district trial copies of all materials before a first order is filled." This often hampers the possibility of testing the materials since suppliers are often reluctant to provide trail copies free.

The program is in its last year, and the District has approved to continue the program with local funds. This is highly commendable, particularly when the evaluation specifications never address the need to determine the success of the program based on a longitudinal study. Nevertheless, the evaluation team inquired from the Project Director the possibility of doing some informal research to

determine to what extent students who had graduated from the program had experienced success in school. The Project Director conducted an informal investigation between May 16 and June 13, 1979. According to this informal survey, of those students who completed three years in the program and had not left the District, none have dropped out of school; they are all performing well in Jr. High or in High School.

COMMENDATIONS

Many aspects of the program deserve to be commended. Among the most noticeable are:

-- All observed instructional staff is bilingual and highly qualified.

-- Bilingual, multicultural education is present and implemented daily, particularly in the Spanish-English programs.

-- Maintenance of native language (English and Spanish) is being stressed

-- Classroom environment reflects "bilingual education"

-- The instructional staff is highly committed to the program

-- The resource teachers provide strong and effective support to the program

-- The District makes an effort to employ personnel knowledgeable of various Chinese dialects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the evaluation team observations and interviews, the following recommendations seem to be in order:

1. Since the District will continue the program, it is recommended that features such as teacher training to obtain MA in bilingual education be maintained.

2. The District should take advantage of the existing pool of highly qualified instructional staff by utilizing them as master teachers in the training of personnel new to the program.

3. The District may wish to review its present process for obtaining teaching materials in order to expedite the process.

4. The effort already begun by the resource teachers and the instructional staff to develop a bilingual curriculum should continue and be expanded to the upper grades.

5. The Chinese program should increase its staff.

6. The Chinese program should also give greater consideration to the maintenance of culture among the Chinese students.

ATTITUDE INVENTORY FOR MULTICULTURAL SENSITIVITY (AIMS)

Developed by:

CHESS and Associates

January 1975

© CHESS and Associates, 1975

The Attitude Inventory of Multicultural Sensitivity (AIMS) consists of three scales developed for use with students in grades three through six. Its purpose is to ascertain the level of individual students' attitudes toward cultures. The three scales are:

Part I	Self and Group Descriptors
Part II	Student Cultural Attitude Survey
Part III	Cultural Attitude Rating Scale

The first two are administered to students. The third is a teacher-rating scale of student attitudes based on behavioral indicators.

RATIONALE

With the cultural diversity existing in our classrooms and in society at large, as well as the state and federal emphases on bilingual and/or multicultural education, there is a need for a systematic method for measuring cultural attitudes. The philosophy behind this requirement is that students of different cultures accept and value not only their own, but a variety of cultural heritages. The lack of any instruments sensitive to cultural awareness and attitudes led to the development of the Attitude Inventory of Multicultural Sensitivity (AIMS).

The basis of the instrument is a modified version of Krathwohl's hierarchy of the affective domain through the valuing level.

These are defined as follows:

AWARENESS of the existence of other languages and cultures and of the fact that differences exist between them.

ATTENTIVENESS or alertness to information or events about languages and cultures.

TOLERANCES of the differences in languages and cultures.

INTEREST and ENJOYMENT or attainment of satisfaction from participation in language and cultural experiences.

VALUING or considering worthwhile the study of language and culture, or the participation in language and cultural experiences.

According to W. Lambert, the ethnic self-identification of an individual usually preceeds the ethnic recognition of other groups. This self identification becomes evident at an early age. M.E. Goodman in Race Awareness in Young Children noted a considerable awareness of racial characteristics among black children even in nursery schools. Studies carried out by sociologists and psychologists such as Hartley and Rosenbaum suggest that the view children hold of themselves is a basis for understanding their views of others. Furthermore, the feelings or attitudes of young children are very general; they tend to include all the members of a particular group. Also, they are usually quite positive or negative. For this reason, there are

no extensive scales in this instrument, particularly in the parts to be completed by the student.

DESCRIPTION

Part I - SELF AND GROUP DESCRIPTORS is administered to students to determine how the student describes him/herself and how the student describes people from other cultural groups. In both cases, adjectives are used as the vehicle of the description.

Part II - STUDENT CULTURAL ATTITUDE SURVEY is administered to students to determine their level of cultural acceptance. The student is asked to respond to a variety of statements about languages and cultures.

Part III - CULTURAL ATTITUDE RATING SCALE is utilized by the teacher to record the frequency of behaviors related to cultural acceptance. It provides a confirmation or denial of the results of Parts I and II and adds additional weight to their results.

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE AIMS

Parts I and II

Parts I and II are included in the Student Survey Booklet. Both English and Spanish versions are available. Choose the one which best meets the needs of individual students. You may find that both forms are necessary for one classroom. The identification information on the front page of this booklet may be

filled out in advance by the teacher or completed by each student at the beginning of the testing period. Parts I and II are to be group administered. Directions as well as all items are to be read to students. You will, therefore, wish to allow sufficient time between items so that each student can comfortably complete them. Repeat any items once if necessary.

At the beginning of the testing session, explain the directions to the students. Students should be assured that there are no right or wrong answers. For Sections A and B the teacher should direct the student to place a check (✓) mark in front of the word or words which best describe himself.

Section C contains three identical columns. At the top of each is a blank line. The teacher should select three ethnic groups, preferably those most representative of the class or community. Students should be instructed to write in the names of these groups in their own test booklet. Make sure that all students list these names in the same order. You should then instruct them to place a check (✓) mark in front of the word or words which best describe each group.

All instructions are to be given to students in advance. Questions may be answered about marking instructions only. Do not explain the meanings of any words.

Part III

In using this portion of the scale, you will be rating each child on the basis of the frequency with which you have observed the specified behaviors. It is, therefore, important to have previously observed the students in situations where cultural attitudes are displayed. You should be able to rate most of your students after several weeks of observing them on the playground, in the classroom, in recorded conversations amongst themselves, etc. To assist you in being objective, keep a log on the form provided of spontaneous comments made by students or events which you have observed. In addition, set up several structured situations from which to record comments or observations in your log. Match these comments to the items on the rating scale.

The Cultural Attitude Rating Scale enables you to place the ratings for your entire class on one sheet. Prior to beginning, print the names of the students, in alphabetical order by surname, in the spaces provided across the top of the page. Make sure to complete the required information at the top left hand side. Then, using the ratings as defined, place a number below the first child's name in the box corresponding to the first item. Do not leave any items blank. You may complete the rating column for the first child or rate as many children as possible on each of the items listed.

DIRECTIONS FOR SCORING THE AIMS

Part I

Part I of the test contains three sections. Section A is totally informational. Therefore, it is not scored.

In Section B the scoring is as follows: off numbers one point, even numbers no points. For example:

_____ 1. Smart = 1

_____ 2. Weak = 0

Section C contains three identical columns. It is scored in the same manner as Section B (i.e., odd numbers are one point and even numbers receive zero points). Count the number of points and enter the total for Part I in the appropriate blank on cover of the student booklet for Sections B and C.

Part II

This section of the inventory contains 20 items in five categories: awareness, attentiveness, tolerance, interest and enjoyment, and valuing. Each item is answered either with a yes or a no response. Each correct response is worth one (1) point.

The correct responses for the items are:

1.	yes	5.	no	9.	yes	13.	yes	17.	no
2.	yes	6.	yes	10.	no	14.	yes	18.	yes
3.	yes	7.	yes	11.	no	15.	yes	19.	yes
4.	yes	8.	yes	12.	yes	16.	yes	20.	yes

Count the number of correct responses and enter the total in the appropriate blank on the cover of the student booklet.

Part III

Compute the total for each student and enter it in the appropriate box at the bottom of the Cultural Attitude Rating Scale.

AIMS CLASS PROFILE

The Class Profile is provided you to record the total scores from Parts I, II and III. This will enable you to analyze the results on an individual as well as a classroom basis. It further enables you to determine gains from pre to post testing periods.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Edwards, Allen, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction, Appleton Century, New York, New York, 1957

Flynn, John T., Herbert Garber, Assessing Behavior: Readings in Educational and Psychological Measurement, Addison-

Goodman, M.E., Race Awareness in Young Children, Addison Wesley, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1952

Hartley, E.L., M. Rosenbaum and S. Schwartz, "Children's Perception of Ethnic Group Membership", Journal of Psychology, 1948, Volume 26, pages 387-398

Krathwohl, David, Bloom and Masia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain, David McKay, New York, New York, 1964

Lambert, Wallace and O. Klineberg, Children's Views of Foreign Peoples, Appleton Century, New York, New York, 1967

Lindeman, Richard, Educational Measurements, Scott, Foresman and Co., Glenview, Illinois, 1967

Mager, Robert, Developing Attitudes Toward Learning, Flaron Publishers, Palo Alto, California, 1968

Maslow, A.H., Toward a Psychology of Being, Van Nostrand, Princeton, New Jersey, 1961

Thurnstone, L.L. and E.J. Chase, "The Measurement of Attitude", University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1929

Valette, Rebecca and Renee Disich, Modern Language Performance Objectives, Individualization, A Handbook, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, New York, 1972

| Item Number | Item Description / Student's Name | | |

			Student's Comment or Attitude/Behavior Observed	to Which This Relates	Positive Rating

			Student's Comment or Attitude/Behavior Observed	to Which This Relates	Rating

CHESS
and Associates, Inc.
EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS and SERVICES
4401 BIRCH ST., NEWPORT BEACH, CA. 92663

ATTITUDE INVENTORY OF MULTICULTURAL SENSITIVITY

Student Test Booklet

Student's Name _____
Teacher _____
School _____
Grade _____
Date _____

SCORES:

PART I B _____
PART I C _____
PART II _____

15 © CHESS and Associates, 197

PART I - ENGLISH

Please place a (✓) mark next to the words that you believe best describe you.

A. I am a:

___ 1. person
___ 2. student
___ 3. child
___ 4. boy
___ 5. girl
___ 6. Chicano
___ 7. Mexican
___ 8. Mexican-American
___ 9. Black
___ 10. White
___ 11. Mestizo
___ 12. Indian
___ 13. Oriental
___ 14. Native-American
___ 15. American
___ 16. Asian-American
17. What else are you? _____

_____

Please place a (✓) mark next to the words that you believe best describe you.

B. I am:

___ 1. smart
___ 2. weak
___ 3. friendly
___ 4. mean
___ 5. a hard worker
___ 6. dirty
___ 7. happy
___ 8. ugly
___ 9. quiet
___ 10. dishonest
___ 11. brave
12. What else are you?_____

_____

or words that best describe the group(s) of people your teacher has given you.

C. Usually _____ people are:

___ 1. smart
___ 2. weak
___ 3. friendly
___ 4. mean
___ 5. hard workers
___ 6. dirty
___ 7. happy
___ 8. ugly
___ 9. quiet
___ 10. dishonest
___ 11. brave
12. What else are they? _____

_____

PART II

Answer each item with either a yes or a no.

_____ 1. People from other cultures look different.

_____ 2. People from different cultures speak other languages.

_____ 3. People from other cultures live differently.

_____ 4. People from different cultures have different ways of doing things.

_____ 5. If the teacher tells us about another culture, I don't listen.

_____ 6. I'm willing to learn how people from other cultures live.

_____ 7. I pay attention to what people from other cultures have to say.

_____ 8. I try to understand people who don't speak my language.

_____ 9. It's OK for people to speak a different language.

_____10. There are many good things about other cultures.

_____11. I like to be around people from other cultures.

Answer each item with either a yes or a no.

_____12. It's OK to make friends with students from different cultures.

_____13. I enjoy celebrating a holiday from someone else's culture.

_____14. Some of my friends are from other cultures.

_____15. I want to learn about other cultures.

_____16. It's fun to be around people from other cultures.

_____17. Learning about other cultures is a waste of time.

_____18. It's important to learn another language.

_____19. Sometimes I try to find out more about other cultures.

_____20. Learning about other cultures will help me be a better person.

Favor de poner una marca (✓) al lado de la palabra que dice lo que tu eres.

A. Yo soy:

___ 1. una persona
___ 2. un estudiante
___ 3. un nino
___ 4. una nina
___ 5. Chicano (a)
___ 6. Mexicano (a)
___ 7. Mexico-Americano (a)
___ 8. Negro (a)
___ 9. Blanco (a)
___ 10. Mestizo (a)
___ 11. Indio (a)
___ 12. Oriental
___ 13. Anglo-Americano
___ 14. ¿Qué otra cosa eres? _____

Favor de poner una marca (✓) al lado de la palabra que dice lo que tu eres.

B. Yo soy:

___ 1. inteligente
___ 2. débil
___ 3. simpático (a)
___ 4. malo (a)
___ 5. trabajador (a)
___ 6. sucio (a)
___ 7. alegre
___ 8. feo (a)
___ 9. callado (a)
___ 10. deshonesto (a)
___ 11. valiente
12. ¿Qué otra cosa eres? _____

_____

Favor de poner una marca (✓) al lado de la palabra o las palabras que mejor describen el grupo(s) social que la maestra(o) ha seleccionado.

C. Casi siempre el _____ es :

___ 1. inteligente
___ 2. débil
___ 3. simpático (a)
___ 4. malo (a)
___ 5. trabajador (a)
___ 6. sucio (a)
___ 7. alegre
___ 8. feo (a)
___ 9. callado (a)
___ 10. deshonesto (a)
___ 11. valiente
12. ¿Qué otra cosa son? _____

_____

SEGUNDA PARTE - ESPAÑOL

Conteste Ud. cada uno con sí o no.

____ 1. Las personas de otras culturas se ven diferentes.

____ 2. Las personas de otras culturas hablan otros idiomas.

____ 3. Las personas de otras culturas viven diferente.

____ 4. Las personas de otras culturas hacen cosas en diferentes maneras.

____ 5. Si el maestro o la maestra nos cuenta de otra cultura, yo no pongo atencion.

____ 6. Quiero aprender cómo personas de otras culturas viven.

____ 7. Presto atención a lo que dicen las personas de otras culturas.

____ 8. Trato de comprender a las personas que no hablan español.

____ 9. Está bien que la gente hable un idioma diferente.

____ 10. No hay muchas cosas buenas en otras culturas.

____ 11. No me gusta estar con gentes de otras culturas.

SEGUNDA PARTE - ESPAÑOL (cont.)

Conteste Ud. cada uno con sí o no.

____ 12. Está bien hacerse amigo(a) de estudiantes de diferentes culturas.

____ 13. Me gustd celebrar las fiestas ue otras culturas.

____ 14. Algunos de mis/amigos son de otras culturas.

____ 15. Quiero aprender más sobre otras culturas.

____ 16. Me gusta estar con personas de otras culturas.

____ 17. Estudiar otras culturas es una pérdida de tiempo.

____ 18. Es importante aprender otro idioma.

____ 19. A veces trato de aprender más sobre otras culturas.

____ 20. Cuando sepa más sobre otras culturas seré mejor.

CUESTIONARIO PARA PADRES DE FAMILIA Y MIEMBROS DE LA COMUNIDAD

1. ¿Tiene Ud. niños apuntados en el programa bilingüe federal, conocido como el programa Título VII?

   _____ Si _____ No (indique su respuesta)

2. ¿Hasta qué grado ha participado Ud. en PTA u otro Comité(s) Consejero(s) relacionado(s) con la escuela?

   Para nada 1 2 3 4 5 Muchisimo

3. a) ¿Hasta qué grado ha participado Ud. en actividades relacionadas con la escuela como, por ejemplo conferencias de padres maestros, asistencia a representaciones hechas en la escuela, etc.

   Para nada 1 2 3 4 5 Muchisimo

   b) Aproximadamente, ¿en cuántas actividades ha participado?

   Ninguna 1 2 3 4 5 Enorme

4. ¿Cuál ha sido el esfuerzo del personal de la escuela para mantenerle a Ud. informado (a) sobre las actividades llevadas a cabo en la escuela?

   Ninguno 1 2 3 4 5 Enorme

El papel del coordinador (es) de la comunidad que representa al programa bilingue es el de ayudar a los padres es estudianets (cuyo conocimiento del idioma inglés es limitado), ajustarse al al nuevo ambiente y ofrecerles a ellos y a otros miembros de la comunidad información continua sobre el programa bilingüe.

5. a) En su opinións hasta qué grado esos coordinadores de la comunidad han sido efectivos en sus efectivos en sus esfuerzos para ayudar a esos padres a ajustarse a su nueva situación?

   Para nada 1 2 3 4 5 Muy Efectivo

   b) Ha recibiro Ud. ayuda del coordinador de la comumidad para familiarizarle a Ud. con información relacionada al gobierno local, hospitales, carreras a seguirse, etc.?

c) En su opinión hasta qué punto han sido efectivos los coordinadores de la comunidad en sus esfuerzos de proveer a los padres de familia y otros miembros de la comunidad con información continua sobre el programa?

Para nada 1 2 3 4 5 Muy Efectivo(s)

d) ¿Alguno de los coordinadores de la comunidad se ha puesto en contacto con Ud. durante el año escolar por teléfono, por carta o por medio de una visita a su casa?

_____ Si _____ No (indique su respuesta)

6. Comentarios_____

INSERVICE EVALUATION

Position_____ Students' Language_____

1. Have you attended any of the inservice workshops or seminars conducted by the Bilingual Resource Team?

YES* NO (Circle One)

*If you, how many sessions have you attended_____

2. a) Overall how helpful were the sessions that you attended in teaching your students?

OF LITTLE HELP 1 2 3 4 5 VERY HELPFUL

b) Please prioritize the following areas in the order of most assistance. provided to you by the Bilingual Resource Teams:

1 --utilization of materials _____

2 --innovative bilingual techniques _____

3 --instruction of the bilingual/bicultural student _____

4 --interaction of teachers and aides _____

5 --history and philosophy of bilingual/ bicultural education _____

6 --diagnosing language needs _____

7 --prescribing for language needs _____

8 --diagnosing needs in classroom subject matter _____

9 --prescribing for needs in classroom subject matter _____

10 --utilization and understanding of Criterion-Referenced Instruments _____

11 --utilization and understanding of Normed-Referenced Instruments _____

12 --cultural awareness _____

13 --other_____ _____

3. As a result of attending any of the inservice workshops or seminars, did you change any of your classroom procedures?

YES* NO (Circle One)

*If yes, please specify how or in what way

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. What affect has the inservice program had in the following areas on student growth?

	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR
a) Academic Achievement	1	2	3	4	5
b) Intercultural, personal relationships	1	2	3	4	5
c) Enrichment through exposure to another language	1	2	3	4	5
d) Learning of a second language	1	2	3	4	5

5. What were the weakest aspects of the program and how would you suggest that they be improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

CURRICULUM QUESTIONNAIRE

Position_____ Students' Language_____

1. In your opinion, to what degree has necessary instructional material for conducting your class or classes been available to you?

NOT AVAILABLE AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 VERY AVAILABLE

2. How useful are the instructional materials that are available to you?

OF LITTLE USE 1 2 3 4 5 VERY USEFUL

3. In your opinion, how helpful has the instructional materials been to your students?

OF NO HELP 1 2 3 4 5 VERY HELPFUL

4. To what degree has the diagnostic instruments/materials necessary to assess student's needs been made available to you?

NOT AVAILABLE AT ALL 1 2 3 4 5 VERY AVAILABLE

5. How helpful were the diagnostic materials that were available to you in:

	NO HELP				VERY HELPFUL
Placing students	1	2	3	4	5
Diagnoising and assessing skills	1	2	3	4	5

6. Is there a need to modify the curriculum material?

YES NO (Circle One)

7. In your opinion, in what areas are there the greatest needs for modification?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. How and in what way(s) would you change the above?

_____

_____

_____

_____